

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed September 25, 2007 considered claims 1, 3-6, 8-28, and 35-37. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15, 17, 21-23, 26-28, 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks et al. (US 2003/0163525) hereinafter *Hendriks*, in view of Bose et al. (US 2002/0042830) hereinafter *Bose*. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* and *Bose*, and further in view of Hendler et al. (US 2002/0042833). Claims 16, 19, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* and *Bose*, and further in view of Rothrock et al. (US 5,729,687). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* and *Bose*, and further in view of Kloubakov et al. (US 2002/0103708). Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* and *Bose*, and further in view of Nakai et al. (US 6,170,016).¹

By this amendment claims 1, 13 and 35 have been amended and claim 38 has been added.² Claim 35 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-28 and 36-38 are pending, of which claims 1, 13 and 38 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to sharing handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of computer users associated with the document. For example, claim 1 defines receiving handwritten annotation data from a first user among a plurality of computer users. Each user has annotation access to a public data entry area available to each of the plurality of users. The public data entry area is for sharing handwritten annotations received from one or more of the plurality of users with other users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the users. Next, claim 1 defines determining that the handwritten annotation data is public data, automatically writing the handwritten annotation data of the first user to a public data entry area in response to the determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data, and receiving a subscription request from one or more of the plurality of computer users to subscribe to the first user's annotations.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0036], [0037], [0043], [0051] and Figures 3 & 4.

Claim 1 further defines adding at least one of the plurality of computer users to a list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations based on the received subscription request, selectively denying on a per-user basis at least one of the plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations based on the received subscription request and distributing the first user's handwritten annotations to those computer users that are on the list of subscribers to access the first user's annotations. Lastly, claim 1 defines preventing distribution of the first user's handwritten annotations to those users that were selectively denied from being added to the list of subscribers subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations.

Claim 12 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 13 is a computer system claim generally configured to share handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of clients associated with the document. Claim 35 is a method claim generally directed to sharing handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of computer users. Claim 38 is a method claim directed to sharing public and private annotations among subscribed users.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Hendriks describes a method for providing handwritten stroke information to an instant messaging (IM) system (par. [0010]). The handwritten stroke information can show up inline, in the IM message box in real time (par. [0011]). Furthermore, annotations can be scaled up or down to fit in the IM message box (par. [0012]). *Hendriks* also teaches sending a message along with handwritten stroke information to those users that are part of the chat session. Users that are part of a different chat session do not receive the handwritten stroke information. *Hendriks* is silent on distributing the handwritten stroke information to select members within the chat session based on a subscription to a certain user's handwritten stroke information.

Bose describes a real-time annotation system where a presenter of, for example, a web seminar, may annotate a page view by drawing on or highlighting various items. The annotations made by the presenter are sent in real-time to all attendees of the presentation. Attendees may also act as leaders, annotating their individual pages (par. [0030]). A lead may send a message to

one, all, or a subset of attendees. The leader may designate a target set of recipients to whom the annotations should be sent (par. [0094]). *Bose*, while teaching sending annotations to a subset of participants, fails to mention denying sending annotations to a participant who wishes to join but is prevented from doing so.

As such, neither *Hendricks* nor *Bose* teaches or suggests selectively denying on a per-user basis at least one of the plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations based on a received subscription request, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, neither *Hendricks* nor *Bose* teaches or suggests preventing distribution of the first user's handwritten annotations to those users that were selectively denied from being added to the list of subscribers subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 13 and 38 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 13 and 38, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to no longer recite the phrase "those recipient subscribers." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1 and 13, as well as dependent claims 3-6, 8-12 and 14-28 be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 13 were objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite "to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to access the first user's/client's annotations." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1 and 13 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending

application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 30th day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973